

Lior Aviram  
 Helena Bellin  
 Ohad Ben-Dror  
 Ron Ben-Menachem  
 Moty Ben Yona  
 David Bernheim  
 Miri Bickel  
 Ruth Dagan  
 Keren Dinar  
 Amir Fisher  
 Stanley Frisch  
 Almog Geva  
 Michal Gottesman-Barak  
 Avi Baum M. Gottlieb  
 Dov Govrin  
 Elad Greiner  
 Ohad Har-Lev  
 Rotem Harari  
 Miriam Heller Lidji  
 Hillel Ish-Shalom  
 Benny Kalifli



TEL AVIV OFFICE  
 42 Montefiore St., Tel Aviv 65201, Israel, Tel: (972)3-7103322, Fax: (972)3-7103322

RAANANA OFFICE  
 315 Givon Center, P.O. B. 410, Raanana 43108, Israel, Tel: (972)9-7713585, Fax: (972)9-7713583

NEW YORK OFFICE  
 Empire State Building, 350 Fifth Avenue, 80th Floor, New York, N.Y. 10118, Tel: (212)284-4111, Fax (212)563-7198

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
 EDWARD LANGER B.S.E.E., M.B.A., J.D., Adv. & Patent Attorney (Israel Bar), Reg. US Pat. Attorney (Pennsylvania Bar)  
 e-mail: elanger@shiboleth.com

RECEIVED Dr. Yuval Karniel  
 CENTRAL FAX CENTER Maya Klaiman  
 Yariv Kesner  
 Roy Kubovsky  
 Edward Langer  
 Tirza Less-Gross  
 Rinat Laniado  
 Ofer Manor  
 Yehuda Mualem

Michael B. Nussbaum  
 Shlomit Ophir-Harel  
 Gadi Ouzan  
 Limor Peled  
 Dana Raucher  
 Linda Reiss-Wolicki  
 Richard M. Roberts  
 Ofer Shapira  
 Amnon Shibleth  
 Orit Sternhell-Zaltzman  
 Yaakov Yisraeli  
 Itzhak Zisman

Tel-Aviv, October 17, 2005

BY FAX (571) 273-8300

Commissioner of Patents  
 US Patent Office, POB 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313  
 Attn: Examiner Lloyd A. Gall

URGENT

Re: U.S. Patent Application entitled:  
**METHOD AND ASSEMBLY TO PREVENT IMPACT-DRIVEN MANIPULATION OF CYLINDER LOCKS**  
 Inventor(s): Moshe DOLEV  
 Application No.: 10/630,916 Filed: July 31, 2003  
 Our Ref: 1703

Dear Examiner Gall,

This letter is to confirm our meeting in your office on Monday, October 31 at 12:00 PM. We have received the Final Office Action dated July 18, 2005, indicating claim 21 is allowable.

The inventor intends to be at the meeting, and to demonstrate a model of the invention (not yet seen).

In advance of the meeting, I would like to summarize the important points of differentiation between the present invention and the cited Stemmerick reference.

As you will recall, in our earlier discussion, it was noted that the Stemmerick reference describes a driver pin divided into two portions, 10 and 11. It is stated that only portion no. 10 moves in response to the impact, while portion 11 remains in place, see col. 3 lines 13 through 16.

This is also stated in the Stemmerick ref. at col 1, line 65:

"the stroke towards the tumbler pin is transmitted to the driver pin which is thereby lifted without any actual movement of the tumbler pin. By the arrangement according to the invention, the effect of the impact is transmitted through the movable member which constitutes one part of the driver pin".

Applicant maintains his earlier position that this statement is inaccurate, as the physical forces act on both the pins. The Examiner maintains that this is of no patentable significance concerning the instant claims.

In any case, further analysis of the Stemmerick reference reveals the statement, at col. 3, line 28:

"to increase the security against the member 11 moving in spite of the impact energy being transmitted to the movable member 10, the member 11 may have a closer tolerance (tighter fit) in the associated bore

שִׁבְלֶת, יִשְׂרָאֵל, רֹבְּרוֹטָס, זִיסְמָן וּשְׁוֹת'

**SHIBOLETH**SHIBOLETH YISRAELI ROBERTS ZISMAN & Co.  
נוראי דין ונווטרינרים  
ADVOCATES & NOTARIES

2

than that of the remaining driver pins. In this way a friction between this driver pin and the bore is ensured."

This feature of Stemmerick is recited in claim 1 where it is stated:

"...wherein at least one driver pin consisting of two members has a closer tolerance ..."

From the above, it appears that the Stemmerick solution defines a frictional relationship with the bore.

In contrast, with respect to the present invention, as stated at p. 12, line 10 of the specification, it is clearly explained that both the tumbler pins and the driver pins move from their locking positions, but in the case of the modified pin assembly the driver pin 78 moves less than the standard driver pin, 54 and consequently the shear line is still blocked (p. 12, line 25 through p. 13 line 2).

In Figure 19, it is explained that even if the intensity is greater than the normal intensity used to unlock the lock in Figure 18, the driver pin in chamber T is displaced, however the tumbler pin which is the longest tumbler pin in this lock, is displaced so as to reach and block the shear line.

In the amendment filed May 17, 2005, the language of claims 1 and 11 was amended to recite a modified pin assembly, provided with motion alteration means adapted to alter the magnitude of its response to an impact-driven blow applied to the tumbler pin.

In view of the above analysis regarding the frictional relationship defined by Stemmerick, Applicant proposes to further modify the language of claims 1 and 11 to indicate that the inventive motion alteration means does not rely on a frictional relationship of the modified pin set in establishing its displacement.

Based on the attached proposal, it is the Applicant's position that claims 1 and 11 distinguish over the cited Stemmerick reference, and the present invention should be granted a patent.

The attached proposal contains the proposed amended claims only, without the Remarks section.

Since these amended claims 1 and 11 are generic, the patent would also include all the claims to embodiments of the non-elected species. For these claims, also attached is a proposal (Appendix "A") of amendments to the claims containing the non-elected species, specifically claims 2, 4-8, 12, and 14-18.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss these matters.

Sincerely,



Edward Langer  
Reg. No. 30, 564